

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/686,373	10/	11/2000	Philippe Duchaussoy	IVD 941-2	6839	
27546	7590	04/21/2003				
SANOFI-S	SANOFI-SYNTHELABO INC.				EXAMINER ,"	
9 GREAT VALLEY PARKWAY P.O. BOX 3026				FONDA, KATHI	ATHLEEN KAHLER	
MALVERN	, PA 19355			ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
				1623	9	
				DATE MAILED: 04/21/2003		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/686,373	DUCHAUSSOY ET AL.	
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kathleen Kahler Fonda, Ph.D.	1623	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPL Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to av final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply of places the applica	ition in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the context o	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THOUSE OF THE CONTRACT OF THE CONTR	g date of the final rejecting FINAL REJECTION. R 1.136(a) and the approper the final	on. See MPEP opriate extension opriate extension Office action; or
 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>07 April 2003</u>. Appea 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be 	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of		in
_ ` ` ` ` ` ` ` ` ` ` ` ` ` ` ` ` ` ` `		and NOTE belowly	
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require furthe(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note be	,	see NOTE below);	
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in		rially raduaina or air	malifying the
issues for appeal; and/or			
(d) they present additional claims without cancelingNOTE:	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claim	S.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	on(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed	amendment
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NO	T place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which were	e newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims wo			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed: none.			
Claim(s) objected to: <u>none</u> .			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-21 and 25-29</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is a	a) approved or b) disapp	roved by the Exami	ner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	t(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).		
10. Other:		Kathleen Kahler Fo Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1623	Lor nda, Ph.D.





Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: of reasons of record. Applicant's argment that there had been no way to prepare compounds of the claims is not convincing in view of column 4 of PETITOU (A). Applicant's allegation of unexpected results is not convincing because there is no evidence of such results, and no claims appear to be limited to such compounds. With regard to arguments about the advantages of the claimed compounds (middle of page 2 of after final response), the Examiner notes that there is no requirement that the Examiner provide a motivation which is the same as Applicant's .